

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2005, claims 1, 3-17 and 19-30 are amended, and claim 2, 18 and 31-61 are canceled. Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-30 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

Claims 1, 2 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner contends that “perceptively distorted” in claim 1 and “visibly distorted” in claims 2 and 18 are not positive limitations.

By this response, the confusing and/or vague language is deleted in favor of language believed to recite the invention with the degree of precision and particularity required by the statute. Therefore, it is respectfully urged that the rejection be withdrawn.

It should be noted also that the claims are amended to change “such that”, “configured such that” and “in which” to “wherein” to provide better form and not to change the scope thereof. Other minor changes to provide consistency are made also.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads (USPN 6,363,159) in view of Saito (USPN 6,182,218).

The indication that claims 3-17 and 19-30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is acknowledged and appreciated. In this regard, it is noted that claim 2, depending from claim 1, is only rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

To expedite prosecution, claim 1 is amended to include the limitation of claim 2, now cancelled, and appropriately address the noted indefiniteness in claim 1. In addition claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 are amended to depend from amended claim 1. As claim 2 is not otherwise rejected, amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable, as well as are dependent claims 3-17.

Also, claims 19-21 and 23-30 are amended to be in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 18, now cancelled.

### **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, overcomes the rejection of record and is in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendment and favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, are respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Edward J. Wise  
Registration No. 34,523

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 EJW:cac  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: October 27, 2005**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**